

The press and abortion advocates are finally beginning to admit the truth about this horrible procedure. The New York Times this morning reported that an abortion rights advocate admitted that he lied about partial-birth abortion just as Planned Parenthood, the National Abortion Federation, and the National Abortion Rights Action League claim that partial-birth abortion is a rare procedure used only under narrow circumstances such as when a mother's life or future fertility is threatened.

Ron Fitzsimmons, the executive director of the National Coalition of Abortion Providers, says that he intentionally lied through his teeth, and I quote him, when he repeated these claims to a Nightline camera. He said he was physically ill after the episode and told his wife that he could not do it again.

The New York Times reported that Mr. Fitzsimmons says the procedure is performed far more often than his colleagues have acknowledged and on healthy women bearing healthy fetuses. The abortion rights folks know it, he said.

The Times took some of its information from an American Medical News article in which Mr. Fitzsimmons was interviewed. Fitzsimmons told the American Medical News that proabortion spokespersons should drop their spins and half-truths. He explained that the disinformation has hurt the abortionist he represents and said, "When you're a doctor who does these abortions and the leaders of your movement appear before Congress and go on network news and say these procedures are done in only the most tragic of circumstances, how do you think it makes you feel? You know they're primarily done on healthy women and healthy fetuses, and it makes you feel like a dirty little abortionist with a dirty little secret."

Based on the false claims of abortion advocates, a so-called compromise to a partial-birth abortion ban is being offered by Senator DASCHLE and President Clinton. The truth of the matter is, it is no compromise at all. In truth, it is irrelevant to partial-birth abortions.

The so-called compromise would ban partial-birth abortions performed in the third trimester except when they are necessary to preserve the life or the health of the mother, but the vast majority of partial-birth abortions are performed in the second trimester.

With regard to third trimester abortions, the bill's health exception effectively permits all abortions. The Supreme Court interprets health abortions to include all those related to social, psychological, financial, or emotional concerns.

The truth is, partial-birth abortion is never necessary. Hundreds of physicians and fetal maternal specialists along with former Surgeon General Koop have come forward to unequivocally state that partial-birth abortion

is never necessary to preserve a mother's life or health or to preserve her future fertility. In fact, the procedure can significantly threaten a mother's health or ability to carry future children to term. Abortion advocates should stop trying to deceive the public with their phony ban.

In the American Medical News article, Mr. Fitzsimmons said the pro-choice movement has lost a lot of credibility during this debate not just with the general public but with our pro-choice friends in Congress. I think we should tell them the truth, let them vote, and move on.

Mr. Speaker, he is right. Abortion advocates should tell the truth about partial-birth abortion. Congress should vote to ban this horrible procedure, the President should sign the ban, and we should move on.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 1

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor on House Joint Resolution 1. It was placed there accidentally, and I ask that it be removed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, the politics of loopholes has angered the general public. We need to stop procrastinating about changes that need to be made in our campaign financing. There are some large loopholes you could run a truck through without violating the law. If we can't agree on all the changes and reforms that are on the table for discussion, at the very least we can close the loopholes.

Today, candidates for Federal office may obtain unlimited, unsecured loans from banks to finance their campaigns. Banks are able to bankroll their chosen candidates by obtaining a mere signature on a loan form without obtaining security for repayment, as is customary in their normal course of business.

I call upon this House to investigate how many unpaid, unsecured loans there are to Federal candidates.

When do these unpaid loans, secured by no assets, become an illegal contribution by a bank?

If a bank is not permitted by law to make a contribution to a Federal candidate, how is it allowed to make an unsecured loan? And what happens when this loan is not repaid? Who gets stuck? All the bank's depositors?

I have introduced a bill, H.R. 783, that prohibits all Federal candidates from making an unsecured loan.

This bill also requires that such unsecured loan be repaid within 90 days after the enactment of the bill, and in the interim, prohibits candidates who currently have an unsecured loan from accepting personal funds from a board member or officer of the bank who holds the loan.

I urge my colleagues to join me in closing at least the one obvious loophole in the law.

In Hawaii the Hawaii State Legislature is concerned about the same thing. The senate bill introduced by Senator Matt Matsunaga, provides that all loans must be repaid by that general election day and if not, the unpaid portion becomes an illegal contribution.

I agree that his bill is a step in the right direction, but it does not go far enough as noted by the Honolulu Adviser.

Let's close the temptation, totally. Let's not allow banks to bankroll any election with hundreds of thousands of dollars even if it is repaid by election day. The ability of banks, using depositors' money, to advance moneys to a candidate is wrong and invites corruption. This practice must be outlawed. My bill, H.R. 783, does that. I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this necessary first step.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. METCALF] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. METCALF addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

□ 1315

FALSE BOMB THREAT PENALTY ACT OF 1997

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mrs. KENNELLY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about legislation that I plan to introduce later this afternoon. This legislation is titled "False Bomb Threat Penalty Act of 1997."

Unfortunately, in this day and age, we are concerned about bombings. We have a situation now in the State of Georgia that is causing great concern because there have been incidences of bombing. We have to take those situations very, very seriously.

I am introducing a piece of legislation that has to do with what we have to worry about in everyday life all across these United States, and this is the fact that there are false bomb threats. This legislation that I am going to introduce will institute a mandatory minimum penalty of 1 year for anyone willfully making a false bomb threat.

Current law allows a sentence of up to 10 years or a fine if one does this, or both, for placing a false bomb threat, but I believe we must institute a more stringent penalty for the commission of this crime. A clear message must be sent that we will no longer tolerate actions like false bomb threats which can cause injury to property and to life.

One constant concern about false bomb threats is that injuries can occur when individuals, often in panic, evacuate a building or a home. Another concern, one that I am very concerned about and have seen this type of action happen, is just the opposite of what I have just talked about, and that situation is when repeated bomb threats